

Mobutu's announcement. Given Zaire's crucial political role in central and southern Africa, it could not simply be boycotted; negotiations had to take place. Nonetheless, Zaire is now showing the way in Africa. Which other countries will follow?

It is a safe guess that such issues will come to the fore in South Africa itself by 1987. They have been already at the root of the policies advocated by the only sizable and reasonable movement of opposition to apartheid led by Kwazulu Chief Minister Buthelezi of the Inkatha movement. Doing away with the cheap and criminal demagoguery of those who are advocating the destruction of the country and of its population through full economic sanctions, Buthelezi recently toured the United States to campaign against them. "Sanctions are being imposed at a terrible cost to the victims of Apartheid themselves," he told an assembly at Boston University on Nov. 17.

In fact, the process of the whole year made clear that economic sanctions as advocated by the Soviet Union, its client states and gullible Western forces, has a double aim: to strengthen the apartheid system by throwing hundreds of thousands of primarily black workers into total misery, which will increase the potential for a radical blow-out in the entire region. Moscow has no other goals, and knows that as Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, and other countries are manipulated into cutting their own throats, the region will slide into its orbit.

In that regard, the Soviet Union did score a few successes in Europe and through the American Congress, and with a few radicals of the Jesse Jackson kind who are more concerned about the 1988 elections than Africa's actual plight. It succeeded, too, in creating a climate of legitimacy for the Soviet-run African National Congress. Thanks to the extreme right wing in South Africa which opposed President P.W. Botha's reform programs, Moscow scored a point there, too.

However, Buthelezi's trip to the United States in the fall, and his experimental attempt to impose a non-apartheid solution in the Kwazululand territory indicate the trend for the next year. The 1.3 million members of Inkatha are now fully mobilized for their rights as they see them. Unless Botha goes a step further in his proposed constitutional reform, he may just become a spectator as the main battles will be between Inkatha and the ANC. This will determine what Buthelezi termed the "plight of the responsible black leaders in South Africa. It is insufficiently realized that there is a life and death struggle taking place which is, bluntly put, a power struggle. . . . The ANC arrogates to itself the right to plan the struggle, to conduct the struggle, etc. It is hungry for power. For the ANC, the primary means of liberation must be violence . . . necklacing, butchering by mobs, hand grenades thrown into black houses. I have now told my people that enough is enough. I have now said that we are prepared to die for what we believe. . . . I reiterate again that it requires a very powerful force to moderate the kind of violence which is spiraling upward in South Africa. . . ."

The end of an era: the fall of Marcos

by Paul Goldstein

Of all the strategic developments in Asia in 1986, none are comparable to the transformation of the Philippines and none has such potentially disastrous consequences for the United States and its allies in the Pacific. As an eyewitness to the fall of Marcos, I can report that the "democratic rise" of Corazon Aquino, the U.S. news media's characterization, belies the actual story of who put Aquino into power, and how.

Since the February coup, the insurgency led by the New People's Army has consolidated its grip on 20% of the country and improved its position in the key urban areas. The economy is deteriorating rapidly. Unemployment is at a record 60-70%, while the "corruption rate," bad under Marcos, is now worse. In economic policy, Aquino and her controllers are leading the Philippines into the status of an International Monetary Fund "colony."

Marcos was overthrown because of economic policy and the Philippines' geostrategic position. The news media and the Congress, along with a variety of U.S. think tanks, perpetrated the myth that the "victory of Cory Aquino" was a victory for democracy. But "People's Power," the slogan of the "liberation theology" Catholic Church under Cardinal Jaime Sin, was mere political cover for a naked military coup directed by the U.S. State Department. While Defense Minister Juan Ponce Enrile and sometimes chief-of-staff Fidel Ramos had complex motives, they were mere participants in a U.S. operation.

Filipino nationalists could only recall how the brutal Spanish colonialists and their priesthood kept Filipinos in a state of subservience.

The basis for the February coup

Historically, the Philippines were the model of the U.S. commitment to development of backward peoples. U.S. rule over the Philippines sought to demonstrate to the world that it were not only possible to raise a backward people to sovereign status, but also a moral necessity. This had been General Douglas MacArthur's commitment and an outlook shared by President Franklin Roosevelt.

The postwar U.S. shift away from MacArthur's outlook toward support of neo-colonialism, especially during the period of the Vietnam War, placed the now-sovereign Philippines in a difficult position. The Philippines came to reflect the best and the worst of American political culture. On the

one hand, the Philippines became an extension of U.S. military operations in Southeast Asia. On the other, as Marcos emerged as the strongman, he built up his political machine as a Chicago-style patronage system that partially broke up the "oligarchic land system" that had dominated the Philippines for several hundred years. However, he did not succeed in eliminating the financial and political underpinnings of the oligarchic system, but was forced into a compromise that portended his demise.

The families, Lopez, Aquino, Laurel, Cojuangco, and others, were not only opposed to Marcos, but were aligned with the international financial networks that controlled the Philippines' insurance and banking companies. These families, many of whom were Japanese collaborators during World War II (including the Aquinos), are backers of Sin's "Theology of Liberation," and in some cases, actively supported the New People's Army. Mrs. Aquino's husband, Benigno, killed in 1983, utilized his brother "Butz" as a liaison to the NPA. The families' conceived of the NPA as the Church did—a needed armed force against Marcos's military. Through this relationship, for example, the present "cease-fire"

The central foreign financial interest in the Philippines was the C.V. Starr group, dominating the insurance and banking groups. Today's successor to C.V. Starr is Maurice [Hank] Greenberg's American International Group and related companies. His influence over U.S. policy toward the Philippines is augmented by a personal friendship with CIA director William Casey.

Despite such interests, Marcos's attempts to industrialize and develop the Philippines led to a certain amount of improvement in the real economy during the 1970s. However, by 1979-80, when the Carter administration's Paul Volcker pushed interest rates up to 20%, Marcos made a fatal mistake. Instead of shifting toward a South Korean industrialization model, he stupidly clung to the austerity prescription handed to him by the IMF and commercial bank controllers of Prime Minister Ceasar Virata and Central Bank governor José B. Fernandez. By the time of the coup, unemployment and underemployment stood at 50%.

Weapon: the media

In Washington, a decision had been taken for a coup by mid-1985. There followed a barrage of psychological warfare unprecedented in scope, creating a climate in Washington in which stupid and opportunistic politicians in the Congress fell into line with those complicit in the plot, calling for Marcos's "democratic" ouster. On the scenes in the Philippines, I saw something almost unimaginable to the average citizen: The media became the single most important instrument of the banker's coup.

Marcos seemed to hold his own, until the interview he gave to ABC's Ted Koppel. He announced a "snap election." Enormous pressure had been placed on him by President

Reagan and his personal envoy, Sen. Paul Laxalt, who informed him that no U.S. aid would be forthcoming unless he permitted elections. It was December 1985, when the opposition was essentially demoralized. Had Marcos not gone ahead with the elections, he could have survived.

However, Marcos knew that he would win the election—and he believed that he still had a deal with his friend, President Reagan. He called the election. The U.S. news media responded with a wild wave of lying that vote-fraud would be used to return Marcos to power. Rep. Stephen Solarz and others set in motion an "anti-vote-fraud" campaign inside the Philippines led by Cardinal Sin. With this in full-swing, the military faction aligned with Enrile and Ramos, around the Reform Officers group called the RAM, with backing from nearly all factions of the U.S. intelligence and military community, saw the critical opportunity for a coup. All the elements had been in place since July 1985.

The elections were held, Marcos won (in fact), the U.S. press and the opposition said that Aquino won, and a "democratic" coup was set in motion. But Marcos and chief of staff Fabian Ver had unearthed the operation and were prepared to suppress it. However, from inside Malacanang Palace, news of the planned suppression reached Enrile and then Ramos, who, with U.S. assistance, moved the coup forces into Camp Anguinaldo.

When the small group of officers around Enrile and Ramos made this move, Cardinal Sin mobilized the population in and around Manila to back them. Through Radio Veritas—financially supported by the U.S. government, as State Department official Michael Armacost admitted—marching orders to the Church legions and the population were issued. Then, President Reagan withdrew support. The rest is history.

A new Nicaragua

At the time, *EIR* founder Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., issued an analysis which labeled the Philippines a "new Nicaragua." Unless certain U.S. and Filipino forces were to move against "Bankers' CIA" and IMF policy, Aquino could be only a transition into chaos. The NPA and Jesuit-controlled forces in the army would win. Subic Bay and Clark Field would be lost, effecting U.S. "controlled disengagement" from the Pacific Rim.

Nearly a year later, that has proven accurate. The cease-fire has allowed the NPA to further its urban infiltration—3,000 NPA cadre now operate in Manila's slums, recruiting for the next phase of civil war.

Although U.S. intervention removed Defense Minister Enrile, to prevent a coup against Mrs. Aquino, the military stays restless. The economic situation continues to deteriorate. Perhaps the new defense minister, Rafael Iletto, and nationalist civilian elements could unite around a "Peruvian solution" to the foreign debt, forming a new coalition for development. Otherwise, a new Nicaragua is inevitable.